

Serial No. 10/689,363

Page 9 of 13

Remarks

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application; claims 21-28 and 30 are withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Forslow, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069278 (hereinafter "Forslow").

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., just to avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, because a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the

Serial No. 10/689,363

Page 10 of 13

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 17 2007

original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Forslow. The rejection is traversed.

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each and every element of the claimed invention arranged as in the claim. The Forslow reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in Applicants' independent claim 1. Specifically, the Forslow reference does teach or suggest at least as recited in Applicants' claim 1 that "... the foreign agent transfers a session from a first network to a second network without session interruption, using the session state data, when the mobile node moves from the first network to the second network..." The Office Action states that Figure 16 of the Forslow reference anticipates this element. Applicants disagree.

The Forslow reference discloses a mobile virtual private network providing a mobile client secure data access to the network and secure data access to the mobile client from within the network when the point of attachment of the mobile client to the network is allowed to change. (See paragraph [0065]). Accordingly, the Forslow reference primarily concerns communication between a mobile client and a network, not with transferring sessions of the mobile client between two different networks.

Figure 16, in particular, shows a flowchart of a process of registering a mobile client to a mobile service router in a foreign network using the mobile IP. (See paragraph [0137]). The process involves the exchange of messages and security keys between the mobile client and the mobile service router and results in authentication and registration of the mobile client. However, what it does not involve is transferring the mobile client session from another network using the session data. The Forslow reference does not disclose or suggest or even consider the effects of moving from one network to another network and registering with the new network the on-going sessions of the mobile client.

The Forslow arrangement is entirely different from the Applicants' invention. The Applicants' invention assures that mobile clients (nodes) receive seamless

Serial No. 10/689,363

Page 11 of 13

connectivity across different networks, including across the different types of networks involving different technologies, because, as claimed in claim 1, the foreign agent transfers the on-going session from one network to another "without session interruption, using the session data." Therefore, when the mobile client, for example, plays a video game over the Internet, the video game does not need to be restarted just because the mobile client moved to a new network and has to register with that network. The foreign agent uses the session state data (here, data regarding the video game progress) to allow the user to continue playing the video game, though the mobile user switched networks.

Accordingly, because the Forslow reference at least does not teach or consider transferring on-going sessions without interruption when the mobile node moves from one network to another, Forslow fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in Applicants' independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Forslow and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim 29 has relevant limitations substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, independent claim 29 is not anticipated by Forslow and thus patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Regarding claim 15, the Forslow reference fails to teach or suggest at least the "wireless modem contained within or attached to a housing of the gateway, wherein the gateway is mobile, and the modem permits wireless communication between the gateway and a wireless network," as recited in independent claim 15. According to the Office Action, paragraph [0088] of the Forslow reference anticipates this element. Applicants disagree with such an interpretation.

As discussed above, the Forslow reference primarily concerns the mobile virtual private network. Specifically, paragraph [0088] identifies the basic components of a network-based mobile workgroup system, which is an access management system for mobile users with the built-in virtual private network functionality. The system includes access points for a mobile user, where the access points could be of different types, such as LAN, WLAN, or Bluetooth. However, nowhere does Forslow indicate that those access points are mobile or that they have a wireless modem to communicate with the

Serial No. 10/689,363

Page 12 of 13

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 17 2007

virtual private network or any wireless network. The Applicants' invention of claim 15 is entirely different.

A gateway for mobile access of claim 15 is the gateway that by itself is mobile, meaning that it is capable of being physically moved in space while still performing its functionality – providing access to mobile clients. The gateway has a wireless modem that allows the gateway, while it is being moved in space, to continue communication with networks. For example, such a gateway could be used by mobile clients riding on the bus or train. (See e.g., Applicants' paragraph [0184]).

The only element that Forslow discloses explicitly as mobile is a mobile user. However, the mobile user cannot be equated with the Applicants' gateway because, according to claim 15, the client and the gateway are two distinct elements. Accordingly, the Forslow reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as arranged in Applicants' independent claim 15. Thus, independent claim 15 is not anticipated by Forslow and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Finally, because all the dependent claims recite additional limitations and all the limitations of the respective independent claims from which they ultimately depend, the dependent claims are also patentable.

Therefore, Applicant's claims 1-22, and 29 are allowable over Forslow under 35 U.S.C. §102. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 10/689,363

Page 13 of 13

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/17/07



Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808